

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
March 13, 2018
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. – Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Lynette Wendel - Chair
Anna Barbieri
Don Quigley
Kent Burggraaf
John Warnas - Excused
Ric Morley - Excused
Justin Peterson - Excused

Community Development Staff

Angela Price – Associate Planner
Amanda Roman - Associate Planner
Jean Gallegos – Admin Asst/Recorder - Excused
Mark McGrath – Director/Community Dev - Excused
Cheryl Peacock Cottle – City Recorder
Stephanie Shelman – Deputy City Attorney

PUBLIC: Pete Simmons, Lucas Turner (ExteNet Applicants); Carol Weber, Zachary Brodsky, Michael Brodsky, David Young, Curt Cochran

WELCOME: 7:04 PM **Commissioner Wendel** assumed duties as Chair, welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

1. The briefing session to review the agenda was conducted by Angela Price at 6:00 p.m. **Ms. Price** gave background information and explanation regarding the master Plan for Small Cell Nodes. Points in the Staff Report were reviewed. **Amanda Roman** reviewed the Staff Report regarding the Hamlet Homes Site Plan and SSDX Ordinance.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Review/approval of Minutes for February 13, 2018.
MOTION: **Commissioner Quigley** – I would like to propose that we approve the Consent Agenda, specifically the Minutes for the February 13, 2018 meeting.
SECOND: **Commissioner Barbieri**
VOTE: No official vote was taken. Minutes are considered approved.

MASTER PLAN CONSIDERATION

- | |
|---|
| 3. 2P18 - Consideration of a Master Plan for 25 Small Cell Nodes. (ExteNet Wireless) (Angela Price) |
|---|

- 3.1 Staff presentation was made by **Angela Price**. 7:05 PM

3.1.1 **Ms. Price** said this is a consideration of a master plan for small cell nodes at various locations throughout the City. The Applicant is ExteNet Wireless. She said the applicable Code was Chapter 13.11.230 and said the reason this application is before the Planning Commission this evening for approval was that it is a requirement for the Telecommunications Master Plan. All node sites will be permitted use applications and if they comply with the requirements of 13.11.230(C) will be reviewed by the Director of Community Development for approval. If any of the sites are on private property or do not meet the requirements outlined in Section C of the referenced code, they will need to go through a Technical Necessity Exception through a Conditional Use Permit, which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission. She gave a basic description of small cell nodes and said she would ask the applicant to go into more detail about that. She said that ExteNet is proposing 25 small cell node locations throughout the City of Taylorsville. They can be located on small structures such as utility poles or street lights or can be free standing structures. Each small cell location is referred to as a "node". These nodes allow network providers to manage the increased demand of voice and data on their existing cellular networks. Small cells improve network reliability, coverage and services by coupling nodes within the existing tower network. Per Taylorsville Land Development Code 13.11.230(C), a Telecommunication Facility Justification Study and Master Plan must be reviewed by

the Community Development Director with a recommendation made to the Planning Commission. After the Planning Commission reviews the Master Plan, ExteNet will submit a Permitted-Use application for nodes that meet the Permitted-Use criteria in Taylorsville City Code 13.11.230(F). These applications will be reviewed at the staff level. For nodes that do not meet the criteria outlined in 13.11.230(F), the applicant will be required to request a Technical Necessity Exception and a Conditional Use Permit from the Planning Commission. Additionally, height justification will be required per 13.11.230(E)(3).

3.1.2 7:11 PM **Ms. Price** added that small cells come in various configurations and the Master Plan proposal will focus on two types. Mounted small cells have equipment that is mounted to a street light or utility pole. In addition to the mounted equipment, a H-frame (commonly referred to as a utility pedestal) is required at ground level and adjacent to the structure. The smart-stack design is a node that has all equipment and wiring encapsulated inside the pole. Smart-stacks do not require a ground level H-frame. The smart-stack is the City's preferred design. ExteNet has proposed mounted cells on four different types of structures, which **Ms. Price** reviewed in detail and showed illustrations thereof.

3.1.3 7:11 PM **Ms. Price** discussed SB 189 – Small Wireless Facilities Deployment Act in detail and summarized by saying that essentially it allows small cells as a permitted use in the right of way and to be approved on an administrative level. It gives the municipalities some opportunity to implement non-discriminatory design standards and really focuses on small cell nodes located within the right of way. This legislation has created a dynamic situation and the Staff Report was tailored to existing Code requirements because that is what the City needs to adhere to now. She also recognized that Staff is confident that this will be signed by Governor Herbert and wanted to make sure the City has the application process in place that addresses all concerns. In early Summer of last year ExteNet, along with several other service providers approached the City about implementing small cell technology and the City's legal department worked with them to put together a Franchise Agreement that would address small cell nodes on Rocky Mountain power poles and the new poles being proposed. That agreement was approved by the City Council in December 2017, Resolution 17-24 and executed by all parties on January 18, 2018. There are no Franchise Agreements in place for street lights and those will need to be in place before that application process is started. Code requirements is the main reason this is before the Commission this evening; 13.11.230(C) requires a telecommunication facility justification study must be reviewed by the Community Development and a recommendation made to the City Council. Staff has done an in-depth review and made a recommendation to the Commission this evening. She provided to the Commission a hand-out outlining details therein and discussed Franchise Agreements, Code requirements, Rocky Mountain Utility Poles, existing street lights, new street lights, new nodes being proposed by ExteNet and alluded to the fact that there is a Franchise Agreement already in place with the City for new nodes. 7:29 PM **Ms. Price** went over the Master Plan provided by ExteNet.

3.2 **FINDINGS:**

- 3.1.1 This application was initiated by ExteNet.
- 3.1.2 The applicant is requesting approval of a Master Plan for 25 small cell wireless facilities.
- 3.1.3 There are four types of proposed wireless facilities including nodes on existing Rocky Mountain utility poles, new poles, existing and new City street lights.
- 3.1.4 A Franchise Agreement is in place for nodes located on Rocky Mountain utility poles.
- 3.1.5 A Franchise Agreement is not in place for nodes located on new poles, existing and new City street lights.
- 3.1.6 Proposed node locations that are collocated in UDOT right of ways must obtain authorization from UDOT.
- 3.1.7 Proposed node locations outside of the right of way must obtain an easement from the property owner.
- 3.1.8 Master Plan is reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- 3.1.9 Nodes complying with 13.11.2230(F) will submit a Permitted-Use application.
- 3.1.10 Nodes that do not meet the requirements of 13.11.2230(F) will require a Technical Necessity Exception and Conditional Use permit granted by the Planning Commission.
- 3.1.11 Typically, light poles in neighborhoods are between 12'-20' high, proposed neighborhood nodes are between 25'-33' high.

3.3 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

- 3.3.1 ExteNet will submit a Permitted or Conditional-Use application for each node location to determine feasibility, location and design. Each application shall be complete and include site plan showing the node location and right of way, relevant easement, UDOT or rocky Mountain Power approval, if applicable, equipment elevations including justification, design and color.
- 3.3.2 ExteNet will enter into a Franchise Agreement for all new poles, street light nodes or any other node type that is not covered by the existing Franchise Agreement prior to submitting the site-specific application.

- 3.3.3 Prior to approval, UDOT authorization will be required for all nodes adjacent to a UDOT road, within the UDOT right of way, or on a UDOT structure. Easements will be required for all nodes outside of the right of way. Rocky Mountain Power approval will be required for all nodes on their infrastructure.
- 3.3.4 ExteNet will work with the City on node design to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhood infrastructure and mitigation of equipment in the right of way or easement, including but not limited to, self-contained pole design, color, and lighting design.
- 3.3.5 ExteNet is aware of at least two potential projects that may impact their proposed small cells. These include the Redwood Road streetscape project and the Mid-Valley Connector. Any equipment placed on Redwood Road north of 5400 South may be removed during the streetscape project and it will be ExteNet's responsibility to replace the poles at their expense, ensuring compliance with applicable ordinances and statutes at the time of construction. Nodes located along the Mid-Valley Connector project shall not conflict with proposed improvements. Nodes located in these two project areas will be compatible with streetscape design standards.
- 3.3.6 ExteNet will be responsible for expenses related to maintenance and upgrading of nodes to ensure compatibility with streetscape design.
- 3.3.7 Equipment will be contained within the nodes, modeling the smart-stack design.
- 3.3.8 Mounted small cells on existing solid poles will have wiring contained within the conduit.
- 3.3.9 Minor modifications to the Master Plan can be approved by the Community Development Director. Significant modifications shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission.
- 3.3.10 The applicant complies with all applicable City Code, Ordinances and Agreements.

3.4 **DISCUSSION:**

- 3.4.1 7:33 PM **Commissioner Barbierr**i asked about the relationship between city and telecommunication companies. She wondered if Taylorsville is required to take upon any company that comes forward and meets the requirement or if the City can be selective about the ones they have, if there are any limitations, and does the law passed by the legislature give the City any power. **Ms. Price** replied that she can only speak to general terms by saying that SB189 allows that all small cell proposals within the right of way must be allowed, but that they do have to meet city design standards and statutes, including allowable zoning districts.
- 3.4.2 **Commissioner Wendel** said that there are four proposed versions of the nodes and there are only Franchise Agreements for two and wanted to know if the Commission would be allowed to vote on the "potential" of a Franchise Agreement. In the Staff Recommendation it seemed to be hypothetical. There is a confirmed Franchise Agreement on two but wanted to know if just saying a Franchise Agreement would be required for the other two would suffice. **Ms. Price** said that she would ask the Legal Department representative address that question. However, essentially if there is not a Franchise Agreement or the requested data in place, Staff will not be able to review an application.
- 3.4.3 7:37 PM **Stephanie Shelman** (Deputy City Attorney) addressed the question regarding Franchise Agreements and stipulations in new legislation, saying that the Franchise Agreements will be in place when the other sites come in. There are some things that the City cannot require Franchise Agreements on, one being under the new legislation is for new poles. **Commissioner Wendel** said that then that being one of the items that does not have a Franchise Agreement yet it would not make a difference then. **Ms. Shelman** said that it does. **Ms. Price** said that was the piece that changed this afternoon. **Ms. Shelman** said the legislature action does not allow Franchise Agreements for new poles. The applicants still must get permits for construction but will not be required to get a Franchise Agreement. **Commissioner Wendel** then asked if the existing street lights that do not have a Franchise Agreement will still need to get one. **Ms. Shelman** said that was correct.
- 3.4.4 7:38 PM **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked where is it that a Franchise Agreement is required in city ordinance. **Ms. Shelman** said that she did not know for certain the specific section, however, that cities can require Franchise Agreements for uses in public right-of-ways but she was reasonably certain that it is covered in State Statute. She said she would look into that and provide him the specific reference. **Commissioner Burggraaf** advised that he was just curious because the City is putting that burden on the applicants and wanted to make sure the City has the proper basis for doing that. It is a permitted

use but in the section that outlines the parameters for that permitted use, Franchise Agreements are not addressed. Ms. Shelman said that she will provide the Statutory Reference to him later.

- 3.5 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** 7:40 PM Applicants Pete Simmons (Representing ExteNet Technology Associates) and Lucas Turner (External Relations Manager) from ExteNet gave a presentation. Mr. Simmons complemented Staff on being very easy with which to work and for Ms. Price's very thorough presentation. Mr. Simmons addressed the Franchise Agreement issue saying the one in place between ExteNet and Taylorsville, Section 6 covers the need to have a Franchise Agreement when using City poles. That ExteNet and the City are still working on swapping out some of the street lights. They are planning on five locations throughout the City, including Streetscape Designs. He showed an Illustrated map of proposed nodes, reviewed the design process and network evolution, along with service coverage. He showed photos of different types of poles and designs.
- 3.6 **DISCUSSION:**
- 3.6.1 7:56 PM Commissioner Quigley asked why they were concentrating on only two areas at this time. Mr. Turner said the reason why was because those are the areas right now that Verizon sees the most need. Whereas other areas are not at that point in time but the need will increase into the future.
- 3.6.2 7:58 PM Commissioner Burggaarf asked for clarification regarding Franchise Agreements and asked if the applicants were okay with that being a stipulation for approval tonight. Mr. Turner said they were agreeable and went on to list other cities that are working on Franchise Agreements with them. He described some negotiations with other cities and performance capabilities and said all types perform similarly. He outlined four options to correlate with existing poles, etc.
- 3.6.3 Commissioner Wendel wondered why they had picked Taylorsville to be first for this use out of the entire Wasatch Front. Mr. Turner said that Taylorsville was the first City to award them a Franchise but they have been working with Salt Lake City for over a year, also Midvale, Cottonwood Heights, Draper, and Holladay. Commissioner Wendel then asked what the objections the other cities have had and Mr. Turner said that with Salt Lake City there were pricing negotiations but they are actually moving forward now. There was no issue with Holladay, just constraints within their process. Draper wanted to see what was going to happen in the Legislature first, same with Midvale. Commissioner Wendel asked if there were a performance capability that is different between these four different versions of posts that are being contemplated for use or are the nodes, technology technically the same. Mr. Turner said that it is all the same, just what type poles are being used. The internal workings are all the same. Commissioner Wendel asked for explanation then as to why there are four different options to be looked at. Mr. Turner said the main reason for the four options is because they are trying to look for existing structures (power poles and street lights). For other options it is because they are unable to work with Rocky Mountain Power or there are no street lights in the location that Verizon is looking at. It is predicated more on location than different designs. Commissioner Wendel asked why they are not considering solar power instead of having to rely on a power box. Mr. Turner said they are looking at that option in the future.
- 3.6.4 Commissioner Barbieri asked about the "H" Frame technology wondering why they are so tall. Mr. Turner said that Rocky Mountain Power has design standards for the electrical meters which eliminates them from being flat on the ground. 8:03 PM Mr. Turner gave additional clarification regarding needed sizes of small cells.
- 3.7 Commissioner Wendel opened the public hearing and called for comments. 8:05 PM
- 3.8 **SPEAKING:** 8:06 PM Carol Weber with ExteNet. Ms. Weber answered questions regarding heights of meter pedestal saying that it must be a certain height so that they can drive by and read it, which is part of the electrical standard. ExteNet would like to change that but has been fighting that all across the United States for a number of years to no avail. What it is is a meter to read how much power is being utilized. Another thing she wanted to address was the smart stack, saying that it is not co-locatable. Today's request is for Verizon but another day it could be another company. She explained that Macros are the big towers and a small cell is designed to take on less capacity so is usually put where the need is having too many pings, for example at a Starbucks where they have free WiFi, which uses a lot more and the tower in that location must be able to handle it. With a small cell, because it is shorter, absorbs that much capacity away from the large tower so it doesn't fail. That is why there is a need for so many small cell units. Commissioner Wendel said it seemed reasonable that a location such as Starbucks would be using a different internet provider not a cell provider, such as Century Link, etc. Ms. Weber said that would be the large tower provider which is different than the small cell ones.
- 3.9 Commissioner Wendel closed the public hearing and asked for discussion amongst the Commissioners or a motion. 8:08 PM Commissioner Wendel asked about this bill only having been about three days old if there

were anything that **Ms. Shelman** felt the Commissioner should be aware of before voting on this issue. 8:09 PM **Ms. Shelman** gave clarification on new legislation and noted no legal concerns.

- 3.10 **MOTION: Commissioner Barbieri** - I will make a motion that we approve File #2P18 for ExteNet's Small Cell Master Plan based on the Findings and Provisions as stated in the Staff Report adding a condition that new poles are covered under the existing Franchise Agreement with provisions as stated in the Staff Report and presentation. We also need to make clear that we need easements and authorizations required for all nodes on private property. 8:11 PM
SECOND: Commissioner Burggraaf
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passed.

DISCUSSION ITEM

4. Hamlet Homes Site Plan and SSDX Ordinance Discussion – Amanda Roman/Associate Planner
 **8:14 PM**

- 4.1 **Ms. Roman** presented this item saying Hamlet Development Corporation has provided Staff with a revised site plan for approximately 8.62 acres of property at 3845 W 4700 S.

4.1.1 The Planning Commission recommended approval of a General Plan Map amendment and a Zoning Map amendment to the City Council on November 14, 2017. On January 17, 2018, the City Council recommended a Site Specific Development District (SSDX) zoning classification instead of the RM-12 (multi-family residential with up to 12 dwelling units per acre). The purpose of the discussion item is to work through any issues the Planning Commission has with the site and landscaping plan before the official ordinance is crafted. Once the ordinance has been written, the applicant will come before the Planning Commission to ask for a positive recommendation to the City Council for a zoning Map change from Hospital (H) to SSD-X.

4.1.2 8:19 PM **Ms. Roman** reviewed the site plan analysis as follows: (1) The applicant is proposing 87 residential lots, with a density of 15 dwelling units per acre. That density is slightly higher than the 14.31 that was approved by the Planning Commission on November 14, 2017 but has four less units. The applicant understands the concerns with higher density housing, and has proposed a site design to help mitigate those effects; (2) The entrance road to the development has been updated to include a tree-lined median and an entry monument; (3) There is a 33' wide pedestrian promenade through the middle of the development leading to the 2.67 acre park, which includes picnic areas and a fenced-in dog park; (4) The applicant addressed parking concerns by moving the housing to the west. Guest parking has been added along the Bangerter Highway border and along the west lot line. There are 65 surface parking stalls (up from 44), providing each unit with a total of 2.75 stalls. At this point, **Ms. Roman** showed an illustrated preliminary landscaping plan. She explained that this item is being heard this evening for discussion only and asked if there were any questions.

4.1.3 **Commissioner Burggraaf** asked if during the process of writing this ordinance there would be a bonding feature added. **Ms. Roman** said that would be the case, that all projects must bond for 6% of cost of improvements. He then wanted to know how this compared to a Planned Use Development (PUD). **Ms. Roman** said that was what they were proposing originally because the PUD allows for more flexibility with design to give them more density. They were at 14.31 units per acre originally and can go up to 15 in the RM-12 zone. It was the City Council that recommended the SSD-X zone for the site. **Commissioner Burggraaf** then asked why that was the case and what their issues were. **Commissioner Wendel** said that she thought it was probably because there were a lot of questions regarding the Bangerter Highway development and in changing of the zone, not wanting to do it throughout the entire City. That is a question that only the City Council or the Mayor could answer. **Commissioner Burggraaf** added that he asked the question to see if anyone had been to that Council meeting and, therefore, knew the reasoning. **Commissioner Wendel** suggested addressing that question with the Mayor or City Council after the meeting.

- 4.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** 8:26 PM **Michael Brodsky** (applicant) explained his process thus far.

4.2.1 That they started at the Development Review Committee meeting in July with the concept and with the Planning Commission in October. When they made their first presentation the Commission suggested they come back with more information, which they have done. He knew that the Commission wanted to hear from the City Council as to why they specifically recommended the SSD-X zone and volunteered that the City Council informed him that they liked his plan and thought it to be a good use for the property and thought that the SSD zone would be appropriate for one very specific reason, which was that if it were approved as a PUD, someone could come in behind if the project were not completed by Mr. Brodsky and take advantage of that rezone and build something very different from this proposal. The SSD zone is very restrictive inasmuch as they are

required to prepare a development agreement that is very specific as to the site plan, amenities, architecture and landscaping. Those details are explicitly spelled out in this development agreement.

4.2.2 If Mr. Brodsky does not actually close on the property and move forward with this specific plan, the application is void. The Council's concern was that they liked the plan but wanted to make sure that is what they got. That was their primary reason for that suggestion. As a result of the first Planning Commission meeting, they expressed specifically a real concern about what was happening with Bangerter Highway and asked for a number of things to be done, one of which was to negotiate with UDOT and prepare a traffic study to demonstrate the impact of this project on the surrounding area.

4.2.3 One finding on the traffic study was that in the conclusion they discussed current use of the property (medical office zone) would generate ten times the traffic that this proposed residential use would. The second thing they did was make end runs with UDOT, after which they made an agreement with them whereby they have identified the amount of his property that they will need in order to develop the overpass at 4700 South and Bangerter Highway. That amount of property has been excluded from the development plan and UDOT is negotiating with them for the price of that piece of property. He has found through experience that these types of negotiations end up making a better plan than started with.

4.2.4 A result has been that Mr. Brodsky has designed a perimeter road along the east side of the property, with parking stalls along the property line, which creates a significant buffer of 60' between the proposed property line and the residential homes. He asked the Commissioners to bear in mind the statements presented by the representatives from IHC that they have attempted for years to find suitable medical uses without success and did not feel with the potential for growth in the City that there was even a need for more medical space. That they have held back two acres to be used in case future expansion is necessary for them. Mr. Brodsky went over the illustrated site plan and discussed specifics thereof. He also discussed the landscaping and parking plans in detail. He ended his dissertation saying that they have submitted a draft of SSD-X/development agreement to Staff. He advised he would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

4.3 **DISCUSSION:**

4.3.1 **Commissioner Wendel** asked if UDOT had given Mr. Brodsky any information as to what sound walls or what else they would be doing in that area, specifically if a 6' high wall would be sufficient. **Mr. Brodsky** said originally they proposed a 6' high masonry wall along the roadway and that was before they realized what UDOT was going to do in that area. As of this date, they plan on the distance from the new homes to the current edge of UDOT's property line is 115 feet. When they build their expansion on Bangerter they will include an 8' high masonry wall. **Mr. Brodsky** did not feel that the distance from their homes to the current property line made it appropriate to expend funds on a masonry wall that would probably be torn down by UDOT. **Commissioner Wendel** said that is why she asked the question because she knew that UDOT looks at 8' high walls, depending on their cost efficiency, etc. She said that she was happy with the new plan seeing the extra parking added, the dog park and promenade. She commented that she has access to signage to help them with the dog park should they express an interest in that. 8:48 PM

4.3.2 **Commissioner Quigley** complemented Mr. Brodsky on what they have done. That he was very much in favor of the SSD zoning on this site. He remembered in the original discussion he was concerned because there was a request for a zoning change and the question was if the zoning change was approved and the applicant does not follow through with the development what then. He supported approval for this type of zoning and the plan for the development in general.

4.3.3 **Mr. Brodsky** explained the proposed timeline being that after Planning Commission approval, it will take about 120 days for construction from groundbreaking to paving and utilities, then another 100 days until models are completed. He asked Staff if it would be possible to come back to the Planning Commission on the March 27th meeting, to which **Ms. Roman** said that would be the Community Development Director's decision and she would let Mr. Brodsky know what that is.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: 8:54 PM **Commissioner Quigley** gave his report on the City Council meeting he attended on Feb 28, 2018. He said the only thing of interest to the Planning Commission were a couple of things discussed in the past, one was the changing of the fence ordinances, which was passed by the City Council. He added he was disappointed with the matter regarding the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) issue and was not happy with the way it was presented to the City Council. His point was that he was frustrated that the City Council kicked it back to the Planning Commission for a third time. **Commissioner Burggraaf** said he did not understand that it was kicked back but rather that just a couple of motions were made, neither of which carried. **Commissioner Wendel** asked that Councilman Cochran clarify what transpired. **Councilman Cochran** said what happened was the Council sent it back to Staff. The Council did not have all City Council members present that night and it was a tie vote. The decision was made to give it back to Staff because what was in front of the Council was changing the wording of the ordinance and there

were other issues that came up and facts that they did not feel were complete enough on which to base a decision. **Mr. McGrath** has assured him that there would be more information provided for their next meeting on this issue. **Commissioner Quigley** said that the proposal ended up eliminating the 800 square foot portion and just going with 30%. **Commissioner Burgraaf** said that the proposal by that applicant to approve it at 900 square foot also did not pass. **Councilman Cochran** said that was correct and it was important to note that when an ordinance such as this is passed, it affects the entire City and not this one applicant. He suggested one option being if this issue could be open to a Conditional Use Permit process. **Ms. Price** asked if that was for accessory dwelling units in general and said that an ADU under the current statute does have to obtain a Conditional Use Permit through the application process. The question at hand is more allowable size versus the application process. **Councilman Cochran** said if that is already the process by obtaining a Conditional Use Permit, then he wondered why there was a need to change the ordinance as well. **Ms. Price** said that it was because the applicant built an ADU in a larger size than allowed and was asking for forgiveness. **Commissioner Wendel** said that applicant could have built the required wall and reduced the size of the ADU by now easily. **Councilman Cochran** asked if the Conditional Use negates the need for the ordinance. **Ms. Price** said that the ordinance states that a Conditional Use Permit must be obtained and meet the criteria outlined in the ADU portion of the City Code. **Commissioner Wendel** thanked everyone for their input and said further discussion will occur when this comes back.

This item was for discussion only. No motion is required.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Quigley** the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Admin Assist/Recorder for the
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on April 10, 2018.